UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.39
21 April 1977
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 18 April 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 31/88

Organization of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within three days of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 11.a.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/88

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Ad Hoc Committee was scheduled to hold two sessions in 1977, the first from 18 to 24 April and the second from 19 to 23 September, in order to carry out its mandate from the General Assembly under resolution 31/88.

2. While in 1976 the work of the Committee had been so slow as to cause concern to some delegations, in 1977 some progress seemed possible. During the past year there had been a somewhat more positive response to the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

3. Specifically, in paragraph 2 of its resolution 31/88, the General Assembly requested the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to continue their consultations with a view to formulating a programme of action leading to the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean, and in paragraph 3 it had invited once again all States, in particular the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, to co-operate in a practical manner with the Ad Hoc Committee in the discharge of its functions. With regard to paragraph 3 of the resolution, he had just sent a letter to the permanent representatives of the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean to invite them once more to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, emphasizing the importance attached by the littoral and hinterland States of that ocean to their participation, and to ask them to communicate their views on implications for their security and other interests of the proposal to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and on the best means for achieving that goal, indicating such modifications as might be found necessary to reconcile the views and interests of the various States. Although the preceding year's invitation to those States had not been accorded the response hoped for by the Committee, during the past 12 months certain major Powers seemed to have adopted a more positive approach with regard to the objectives of the Declaration.

4. With regard to the Ad Hoc Committee's consultations with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, he invited the members of the Committee to make suggestions concerning the procedure to be adopted.

5. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka) said it was regrettable that in spite of repeated invitations from the General Assembly and the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, certain great Powers and certain major maritime users of the Indian Ocean had not found it possible to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee. Furthermore, the great-Power rivalry and the escalation in military activity in that vital region gave cause for growing concern. However, it was heartening to find that the question of demilitarizing the Indian Ocean, or

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

at least limiting the arms race in the region, was being seriously considered. The great Powers now seemed prepared, at least in principle, to study the possibility of controlling their arms race in the Indian Ocean. Certain recent statements made by the President of the United States of America and preliminary discussions between the great Powers suggested the likelihood of a meeting in May 1977 at which the question of the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean would be considered. It might be overoptimistic to expect concrete results from that meeting, but there was reason to see it as showing that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace was making some impact on the thinking of the great Powers.

6. He believed that the Chairman should continue his consultations with the two great Powers concerned and encourage them to agree to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee.

7. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran), recalling that the major problem encountered by the Ad Hoc Committee was that it was getting no co-operation from the great Powers and some of the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, welcomed the fact that some causes for hope had appeared in the past few months. In the memorandum of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the cessation of the arms race and on disarmament, the text of which had been communicated to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, the Soviet Union had made it clear that it would be prepared to study the question of its attitude concerning the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean. Moreover, the President and the Secretary of State of the United States of America had recently made statements on possibilities and options concerning the Indian Ocean. He believed that, on the basis of that memorandum and those statements, the Ad Hoc Committee should approach the Soviet Union and the new United States administration in order to obtain their co-operation.

8. While he commended the Chairman for his new invitation to the great Powers to co-operate in the work of the Committee, he felt that an initiative at the official level was not sufficient; the Chairman should supplement that initiative with personal consultations of a private nature. However, on that subject he would accept the views of the other members of the Committee.

9. Mr. MULYE (India) said that the idea of sending a letter to the great Powers and the proposals made by the representatives of Sri Lanka and Iran were all the more valuable because new opportunities appeared to have opened recently to the Committee. Until now, the Committee had been frustrated in its work by the lack of co-operation from the great Powers and the major maritime users not represented in the Committee. However, at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly the USSR had declared its readiness to participate in consultations which would lead to the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean. The United States, for its part, had shown some interest in demilitarizing the Indian Ocean, or at least in slowing the arms race in that region. The Committee should, of course, avoid overoptimism, as the representative of Sri Lanka had said, but the fact remained that

(Mr. Mulye, India)

the initiatives that might be taken by the Chairman to determine what change there had been in the position of the great Powers deserved the Committee's full support. For his part, he left it entirely to the Chairman's discretion to decide what action should be taken. With regard to the letter, he would like to know whether it was intended to invite the great Powers to the Committee or to propose the holding of informal meetings with them. In the past the approach using informal meetings had often proved useful.

10. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the representative of India on the question of whether it was preferable to invite the great Powers officially or to interest them in informal consultations, said that the decision would depend on what the great Powers themselves had in mind and what they would consider the best means of co-operating with the Committee. As he understood it, his task would be to consult with the delegations of the great Powers, and on the basis of the results of such consultations, the Committee would decide the manner in which it would ask the great Powers to participate in its work.

11. Mr. OXLEY (Australia) said that he approved of the general line of action described by the Chairman and also emphasized the need for retaining the necessary flexibility. Like other representatives, he recognized that the Committee could find some cause for encouragement in press reports. The great Powers apparently had the intention of concerning themselves with the question of the Indian Ocean on a bilateral basis. While the Committee had been able to observe some progress with regard to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, it had to ascertain more clearly the attitude of the great Powers, and it was therefore useful that the Chairman should undertake consultations to that end.

12. Mr. RASOLONDRAIBE (Madagascar) commended the Chairman's action in sending a letter to the Powers whose co-operation the Committee was trying to obtain.

13. His delegation could not help feeling some scepticism concerning the press reports on the Indian Ocean; if there was an intention to deal with the problems of that ocean, why not do so in the Ad Hoc Committee, which included all the countries concerned? It would be preferable if those who were disturbing the peace and security of the Indian Ocean region would state their intentions before the Committee. The procedure described by the Chairman was acceptable; as other representatives had said, it was important to remain as flexible as possible, since the question was of great importance, and care must be taken to avoid destroying bridges by immoderate demands. In any case, the great Powers had the duty to keep the Committee informed of the substance of their discussions concerning the Indian Ocean, since the members of the Committee were those most concerned.

14. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) asked whether the Chairman, in his consultations with the great Powers, would try to determine in what way they would be prepared to co-operate with the Committee or would ask their views on the problem in general.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that he would endeavour to obtain information on both of the subjects mentioned by the representative of Iraq. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee was entrusting him with the task of entering into consultation without delay with the Powers concerned, in order to discuss with them the co-operation they would give the Committee in the discharge of its functions, and reporting to the Committee at its next meeting, which would be held during the same week.

16. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

17. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to state their views on how the 10 meetings assigned to the current session should be utilized.

18. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) felt that, as the representative of Iran had indicated, the real problems lay in the attitude of the great Powers and the subsequent work of the Committee would depend on the results of the Chairman's consultations.

19. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the date of the next meeting should be fixed on the basis of the results obtained in his consultations with the great Powers, which should take one or two days.

20. It was so decided.

21. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 31/88, the Committee should continue its consultations with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. Meetings for that purpose should be held during the current session. He believed that it would be preferable to hold such consultations after he had carried out the task just entrusted to him and had reported to the Committee.

22. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) said that after private consultations with the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, it had been found that they did not intend to take a position before the Committee had obtained more co-operation from the great Powers. From that standpoint too, therefore, it was preferable to await the results of the Chairman's consultations.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that if the Committee had no objection, a decision on the consultations with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean would be taken at the Committee's next meeting, after the Committee had heard his report on his consultations with the great Powers.

24. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at noon.

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.40
26 April 1977
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD (PARTIAL)* OF THE 40th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 21 April 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

Organization of the Committee's work (continued)

* No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the question should be considered without summary record coverage.

2. It was so decided.

The discussion covered in the summary record ended at 11.10 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.41
25 April 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 21 April 1977, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

The Chairman's letter dated 14 April 1977 to the great Powers and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean

Programme of action leading to the convening of a Conference on the Indian Ocean

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN'S LETTER DATED 14 APRIL 1977 TO THE GREAT POWERS AND MAJOR MARITIME USERS OF THE INDIAN OCEAN

1. The CHAIRMAN said that three countries had replied to his letter. Greece and Panama had expressed their willingness to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee, and Italy had said that the matter was under consideration. The Committee must therefore decide on the manner in which non-member States would participate in its work. One possible solution would be to grant them observer status, so that they could participate in both formal and informal meetings without however, having the right to vote.

2. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said that he had no objection to the solution proposed by the Chairman but wished information on the procedures used by other committees.

3. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that no definitive precedent had been set and the Ad Hoc Committee was the master of its own procedure.

4. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) said that if all States were invited to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, the group of littoral and hinterland States might become superfluous.

5. Mr. RASOLONDRAIBE (Madagascar) said it was his understanding that all States Members of the United Nations had the right to request observer status but that those countries which were specifically invited to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee would, in addition, be able to participate in informal consultations.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that it was for the Ad Hoc Committee to decide whether different countries should be granted observer status. However, the littoral and hinterland States would be invited to work with the Committee, whereas other States would themselves have to take the initiative in requesting the right to participate in the Committee's work.

7. Mr. JIMANI (Kenya) said that countries which received an invitation to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee should be permitted to participate in informal consultations.

8. Mr. VANDERGERT (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation advocated a pragmatic approach and would welcome the participation of the great Powers and major maritime users, regardless of the form of that participation. If the Ad Hoc Committee made it difficult for States to participate, those States which did not wish to participate would have an additional excuse for staying away.

9. Mr. OXLEY (Australia) said that any State Member of the United Nations could request observer status, but it was then for the Ad Hoc Committee to decide whether to grant that status. The Committee might have some moral obligation to deal sympathetically with requests for observer status from great Powers and major maritime users, but it would be difficult to refuse a request for observer status from any State.

/...

10. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that Greece and Panama had indicated their desire to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee but had not requested observer status.

11. Mr. YEO (Malaysia) said that it would be quite consistent with the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate to grant observer status. Initially, States should be permitted to participate in plenary meetings of the Committee when they wished. However, at a later stage of its work the Committee might wish to invite certain States to express their views on a specific subject, and an appropriate system should be devised to deal with that eventuality.

12. Mr. MULYE (India) said that the Ad Hoc Committee could invite States to comment on a given subject at a given meeting, could grant States observer status, or could permit their participation on a continuing basis. According to paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 31/88, the littoral and hinterland States would participate in consultations concerning the Conference on the Indian Ocean. The Ad Hoc Committee must therefore decide whether such States should be involved in matters other than the Conference. He suggested that the Committee should hold more informal consultations on the subject.

13. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) said that the group of littoral and hinterland States could be enlarged to include Greece, Panama, the great Powers and major maritime users. Consultations could then continue informally within that forum, and any decisions would be formalized by the Ad Hoc Committee.

14. The CHAIRMAN proposed that Greece and Panama should be invited to participate in meetings of the littoral and hinterland States in order to contribute to the formulation of a programme of action leading to the convening of a Conference on the Indian Ocean. He also proposed that the Ad Hoc Committee should proceed with its informal consultations and that the Chairman should send letters to States represented on the Committee, as well as to all littoral and hinterland States, asking for their views on a programme of action leading to the convening of a Conference on the Indian Ocean, so that those views would be available to the Committee at its session in September and could be reflected in the Committee's report.

15. It was so decided.

PROGRAMME OF ACTION LEADING TO THE CONVENING OF A CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

16. Mr. DAMANIK (Indonesia) said that support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace had increased considerably and the willingness of major Powers to consider measures conducive to the implementation of the Declaration had opened up major new possibilities. However, the Ad Hoc Committee had made no substantial progress in discharging its mandate, and although a broad consensus had emerged with respect to the desirability of convening a conference of littoral and hinterland States, there was still no agreement as to the venue, duration, level of participation, agenda or purposes of such a conference. The Committee must therefore review its approach to its mandate and should seek to harmonize the views and interests of the littoral and hinterland States. To that end, it would be necessary

(Mr. Damanik, Indonesia)

to consider the possibility of modifying the mandate of the Committee so as to enable it to focus its attention on the formulation of a draft treaty for the establishment of a zone of peace in the region. That task would require a schedule of meetings extending over a period of four to six weeks, but the fact that the whole process would take several years and that there existed widely differing viewpoints among States should not deter the Committee from implementing the Declaration. Experience had shown that an issue with such far-reaching ramifications could not be resolved in a short period of time, and his delegation therefore considered that work on a draft treaty might best be divided into two phases. The first phase would consist of a series of meetings among the littoral and hinterland States, the aim of which would be to establish the basic framework and definitions for a draft treaty. During the second phase, the littoral and hinterland States, as well as extra-regional Powers, would convene a conference to consider the draft treaty, which would include, among other things, an elaboration of the principal ideas of the Declaration and elements of regional co-operation in various fields. At the same time, it would be necessary to convene additional sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee in order to broaden areas of agreement. Flexibility was vital.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.159/SR.42
28 April 1977
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN OCEAN

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 22 April 1977, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOEWONO (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 31/88 (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within three days of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 31/88 (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN* recalled that at its 39th meeting the Committee had mandated him to conduct consultations with the delegations of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a view to seeking further clarification on the statements made by the respective leaders of the two countries relating to the developments in the Indian Ocean. The Committee had wished also to be informed whether those statements could be construed as indications of willingness on the part of those countries to co-operate with it.

2. In pursuance of that mandate, he had had talks on Wednesday, 20 April, with the delegation of the United States, represented by the Deputy Permanent Representative, Ambassador Leonard. After being informed of the views of the Committee, Ambassador Leonard had stated that at the current stage he was not in a position to give any further clarification on the statements of the United States Government leaders. Although in his view there was definitely a clear desire on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union to deal in a positive manner with the escal ting arms race in the Indian Ocean, there had so far been no steps undertaken of a substantial nature, although some initial procedural actions had been made. The representative of the United States had informed him that substantial talks might be commenced within a few weeks. The United States position with regard to the problem of the Indian Ocean and to the Committee remained unchanged so far, while its future position could not be divorced from mutual and reciprocal actions on the part of the Soviet Union.

3. In the talks which he had had with the delegation of the Soviet Union, represented by Mr. Ovinnikov, the latter had pointed out certain basic points of the position of the USSR in regard to the problems relating to the Indian Ocean and also in regard to the work of the Committee. The Soviet Union considered first of all that a basic point relating to the establishment of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean was the dismantling of foreign military bases. The representative of the Soviet Union had pointed out that his country had never had any intention of building military bases in the Indian Ocean. The Soviet delegation therefore regretted that in the relevant General Assembly resolution reference was made to an "escalation of the military presence of the great Powers conceived in the context of great Power rivalry".

4. The representative of the Soviet Union had expressed the willingness of his country to seek, together with other Powers, ways to reduce on a reciprocal basis the military actions of non-coastal States in the Indian Ocean and the regions directly adjacent thereto. He had added that the Soviet readiness to contribute to the materialization of the idea for establishing a zone of peace in the Indian

---

* The text of the Chairman's statement is reproduced in full in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee.

Ocean should not entail any obstacles to freedom of navigation and research in the Indian Ocean. The participation of the Soviet Union in consultations relating to convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean was dependent on the willingness of the Committee to take into account the Soviet Union's approach to those matters.

5. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) thanked the Chairman for his efforts and his report to the Committee. In view of the importance of the question dealt with, it would be advisable to have the text of the Chairman's statement reproduced in full in the summary record.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that if it was the wish of the Committee, the text of the statement he had just made would be reproduced in full in the summary record.

7. It was so decided.

8. Mr. MULYE (India) also thanked the Chairman for the consultations which he had conducted on behalf of the Committee and for the report which he had presented on the subject. Those consultations had shown that there had been some progress, although the two great Powers concerned had not yet proceeded to bilateral contacts. The Committee was still at a preliminary stage; however, that modest advance in its work should not be disregarded.

9. He then read out a passage from the final communiqué of the Bureau of the New Delhi Ministerial Meeting of the non-aligned countries, wherein the Bureau affirmed its firm and unanimous commitment to the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) and the Colombo Declaration. It had condemned the establishment and expansion of foreign military bases and called for the elimination of great-Power military rivalry in the Indian Ocean. It had further urged the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to desist from membership in military alliances or pacts conceived in the context of great-Power rivalry. The Bureau had noted that consultations were under way for convening a conference on the Indian Ocean and had expressed the hope that the great Powers and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean would co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee; lastly, it had taken note of recent statements by great Powers relevant to the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

10. Mr. YEO (Malaysia) associated himself with previous speakers who had thanked the Chairman for his efforts. He proposed that the consultations thus begun with the Powers concerned should be maintained on an ongoing basis so that the Committee could be kept informed of the development of the situation, particularly if bilateral talks were to take place between those Powers.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that he had raised with the two delegations concerned the question of the possibility of maintaining ongoing contacts; they had replied that if and when new developments occurred, they would get in touch with him and consultations on the question could resume. He then drew to the Committee's attention a letter which he had received the same morning from the Canadian

/...

(The Chairman)

delegation in reply to his letter of 14 April. In that letter the Permanent Representative of Canada recalled that in the past Canada had not participated in the Committee's consultations for the reasons given in the letter addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on 30 June 1976 but stated that he had transmitted the Chairman's letter dated 14 April to the competent authorities of his country and would inform the Committee of the response to its request when he heard from them. He noted that the letter from the Canadian delegation was not a refusal to co-operate and might even be regarded as a slight encouragement.

12. With regard to the Committee's programme of action mentioned in paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 31/88, he recalled the proposals which he had made the previous day during the closed meeting, namely, that he should send a letter to the members of the Committee and to the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean asking for their views and suggestions regarding the formulation of a programme of action, in the hope that their replies would be received in time for the Committee's next session in September, so that they could be included in the Committee's report. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee authorized him to send a letter to that effect.

13. It was so decided.

14. Mr. HSU Yi-min (China) said that the proposal to establish the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace reflected the legitimate desire of the States and peoples in the Indian Ocean region to defend their independence and sovereignty against super-Power infiltration. The proposal had therefore received extremely broad support. The Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had, in its political declaration, explicitly called for the elimination of any manifestation of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean. Furthermore, in a resolution adopted at its thirty-first session, the General Assembly had denounced the intensification of great-Power rivalry in the region and had expressed regret over the fact that certain great Powers had not found it possible to co-operate with the Ad Hoc Committee. There were mounting demands on the part of world public opinion for the two super-Powers to withdraw their military presence from the Indian Ocean. It had been unanimously agreed at the Committee's current session that the Chairman should urge the two super-Powers, namely the United States and the Soviet Union, to clarify their attitude.

15. While placating public opinion every now and then, the two super-Powers had so far done nothing to remedy the situation. On the contrary, their military activities and their rivalry in the Indian Ocean region were constantly on the increase. One super-Power claimed to be in favour of the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, at the same time stating that it was prepared to seek ways of reducing military activity on a reciprocal basis and within the framework of an agreement. In other words, the demilitarization of the region as proposed by one super-Power would serve as a pretext for bargaining with the other super-Power. The other super-Power, which talked constantly about détente and disarmament, had even more on its conscience. It was not only bent on obstructing the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace by harping on repudiated arguments but had also been asserting that, since the Indian Ocean was the only maritime passage

(Mr. Hsu Yi-min, China)

linking the European and Far Eastern sectors of the Soviet Union, it was entitled to have various freedoms guaranteed and needs satisfied. It rejected any mention of great-Power rivalry in the Indian Ocean or of great-Power military presence; such an attitude had completely unmasked the attempt by that super-Power to prevent the Indian Ocean from becoming an anti-hegemonistic zone of peace and had also exposed its wild ambition to elbow its rival aside and establish exclusive domination over the region.

16. In order to establish the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, it was imperative, first of all, to put an end to all expansionist activities by the super-Powers and to halt their rivalry for hegemony in the region; it was also vital to demand that the great Powers should withdraw their entire military presence and dismantle all their overt and covert military bases.

17. The Chinese Government and people had always actively supported the States of the Indian Ocean region in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. They therefore supported the just proposal of those States for the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

18. At the same time his Government hoped that the States in the region, whether big or small would firmly do away with the intervention of the super-Powers, combat expansionism in all its forms and enhance relations among themselves in accordance with the principles of respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.

19. Lastly, his Government hoped that those States would strengthen their unity, jointly oppose imperialist and hegemonist aggression and work together for the convening of the conference concerning the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

20. Mr. THEODORACOPOULOS (Greece) thanked the Chairman and the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for giving him an opportunity to state the views of his delegation with respect to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 31/88.

21. His delegation felt great concern with respect to the outcome of the consultations on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. In line with consistent Greek support for the defence of peace and justice, his delegation would spare no effort in helping the Committee to carry out its task. The principles set forth in the Declaration were consistent with the purposes of the Charter, which Greece had undertaken to respect. That spirit was eloquently reflected in the sixth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). Bearing in mind the provisions of that paragraph, his delegation had voted for General Assembly resolution 31/88, which, in particular, requested the Ad Hoc Committee and the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to continue their consultations with a view to formulating a programme of action leading to the convening of a Conference on the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Theodoracopoulos, Greece)

22. In his delegation's view, the proposed conference, the aim of which was of primordial importance, should be a world conference held at the highest level. In carrying out its mandate, the Committee should bear in mind the provisions of the Charter relating to international peace and security, the principles contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), and the relevant international instruments relating to the strengthening of peace and the reduction of armaments.

23. Greece, as a maritime country, welcomed the fact that the littoral States in the Indian Ocean region which had proposed the convening of the conference had given assurances concerning respect for the principle of freedom of navigation in accordance with long-standing custom and international law.

24. The CHAIRMAN expressed his appreciation for the co-operation he had received from the members of the Committee and the representative of States participating in the work of the Committee as observers.

25. He declared the Committee's current session closed and expressed the hope that at the following session real progress would be made towards the implementation of the objectives set out in General Assembly resolution 31/88.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.